



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/598,256	08/23/2006	Sven Johannes Jeurissen	NL 040212	2036
24737 7590 09/17/2008 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510				
EXAMINER				
PATEL, ASHOK				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2889				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/17/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/598,256

**Applicant(s)**

JEURISSEN ET AL.

**Examiner**

Ashok Patel

**Art Unit**

2889

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  - ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF 298)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 04252007
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_

1. Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. See MPEP § 2173.05(c). Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949).

In the present instance, claim 4 recites the broad recitation "between 80° and 200° C". The claim also recites

"preferably between 100° and 150° C", which is the narrower statement of the previous range.

Further, claim 5 recites the broad recitation "through shrinking" and also recites "preferably heat shrinking", which is the narrower statement of the previous limitation.

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Evans et al (USPN 3602759).

As to claims 1-3 and 5, Evans et al disclose applicant's claimed fluorescent lamp (at least Figures 1 and 7; embodiments I and V) including a glass discharge vessel (envelope 12) in which a gas is present (col. 2, embodiment 1), which discharge vessel is on two sides provided with a tubular end portion having a longitudinal axis, which end portion includes a glass stem (14 or 15), wherein an exhaust tube (not shown, however essential for evacuating the envelope, inserting the discharge fill and sealing the envelope) extends axially outwardly from said stem (5), and

wherein an electrode (16 or 17) extends axially inwardly through the stem for generating and maintaining a discharge in the discharge vessel (12), the electrode includes two pole wires (lead wires) held in position by the stem and connected to plug pins (20) of an end cap (32) fixed to the end portion, characterized in that the end cap (32) is at least substantially made of a heat shrink material (PVC, polyolefin; see col. 2, last paragraph).

As to method claim 5, Since Evans et al's disclosed fluorescent lamp includes all product features as recited in applicant's product claims 1-3, Evans et al's disclosed device is considered as formed by the method as recited in applicant's method claim. The artisan seeking the apparatus claim would necessarily perform the method as claimed.

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly

Art Unit: 2889

owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Evans et al, as applied to claim 1.

As to claim 4, Evans et al do not disclose the heat shrink material activated at a temperature varying between 80° and 200° C, preferably between 100° and 150° C. However, since heat shrink material is known for shrinkage when receiving suitably appropriate heat. In light of this, applicant's claimed heat shrinking temperature range would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for shrinking the plastic material of the fluorescent lamp. It has been further held that where general conditions of the claim are discovered in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable heat shrinking temperature range involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233.

Alternatively, the claim recites heat shrinking material being activated at a temperature varying between 80° and 200° C, preferably between 100° and 150° C. This activating process renders the claim a product-by-process nature. The courts have been holding that: "--In spite of the fact that a product-by-process claim may recite only process limitations, it is the

product which is covered by the claim and not the recited process steps--. (In re Hughes, 182 USPQ 106)--". Also -- Patentability of a claim to a product does not rest merely on a difference in the method by which that product is made. Rather, it is the product itself which must be new and unobvious. (In re Pilkington, 162 USPQ 147)--." Accordingly, "---a rejection based on 35 U.S.C. section 102 or alternatively on 35 U.S.C. section 103 of the statute is eminently fair and acceptable." (In re Brown and Saffer, 173 USPQ 685 and 688). --The determination of the patentability of product-by-process claim is based on the product itself rather than on the process by which the product is made--. In re Thrope, 777 F.2d 695, 227 USPQ 964 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

As such, no patentable weight is given to process step recited in claim 4.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ashok Patel whose telephone number is 571-272-2456. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Minh-Toan Ton can be reached on 571-272-2303. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval

Art Unit: 2889

(PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Ashok Patel/  
**Ashok Patel**  
**Primary Examiner**  
**Art Unit 2879**